

3X

CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL: PRINCIPAL BENCH

Original Application No. 884 of 1991

New Delhi, this the 9th day of March, 1999

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE V.RAJAGOPALA REDDY, VICE CHAIRMAN(J)  
HON'BLE SHRI N.SAHU, MEMBER(A)

Urmila Kataria, Asst. Editor, East  
Block-4, Lev.5, R.K.Puram, New Delhi.

-APPLICANT

(By Advocate: Mrs. C.M.Chopra)

Versus

1. Union of India represented by  
Secretary, M/o Information &  
Broadcasting, Shastri Bhawan, New  
Delhi, and
2. Union Public Service Commission,  
represented by its Secretary, Shahjahan  
Road, New Delhi.
3. Rajendra Roy, Inspector of Exhibitions,  
DAVP, M/o Information & Broadcasting,  
Exhibition Division, Block 'B',  
Kasturba Gandhi Marg, New Delhi.
4. P.N.Dwivedi, Information Officer, Press  
Information Bureau, Shastri Bhawan, New  
Delhi.

-RESPONDENTS

(By Advocate: None)

ORDER(ORAL)

By Reddy, J.-

The only claim of the applicant in this OA is for the grant of benefit of her service as Assistant Editor in Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi which is stated to be a wing of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting in the cadre of Class-II Grade-III post with effect from such appointment and to refix her seniority and also for respective further grades and to get all the consequential benefits.

2. It is the case of the applicant that her case is covered by the decision in OA Nos. 1394/91, 863/91 and 883/91 disposed of by a common judgment dated 16.8.1996 by a Bench of this Tribunal (Chandrika Vyas and others case).

V.A.

3. In pursuance of the notice issued to the respondents counter affidavit has been filed, however, none appears on their behalf for the last several occasions.

4. We have perused the above order passed by the Tribunal and we find that the case of the applicant is in pari-materia with that in the above OAs. The above judgment was rendered in pursuance of the Supreme Court decision in Dhasmana's case decided on 15.7.88. The order passed in the above OAs of Ms Chandrika Vyas and others has been challenged by the Union of India in the Supreme Court, but unsuccessfully. Thus the order in Ms Chandrika Vyas's case has become final.

5. This OA is, therefore, disposed of in terms of Ms. Chandrika Vyas and others' case. The respondents are accordingly directed to refix the seniority of the applicant with effect from the date of her appointment as Assistant Editor and to grant all consequential benefits from the said date. The above directions are directed to be implemented within a period of six months. The OA is accordingly disposed of.

*Sahu*  
( N. SAHU )  
MEMBER(A)

*Reddy*  
( V. RAJAGOPALA REDDY )  
VICE CHAIRMAN(J)

/dinesh/